

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, independent claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the personal interview on February 22, 2006, which included: Examiner Ruth Smith; and Applicant's representatives, Edward Kessler, Reg. No. 25,688 and Michelle Holoubek, Reg. No. 54,179. During the interview, Applicant's representatives discussed differences between U.S. Pat. No. 4,649,924 to Taccardi and the claimed invention. An agreement was reached, and the claims have been amended as discussed during the interview. Arguments made during the interview are incorporated and expanded herein.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103***

Claims 1, 2, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,588,432 to Crowley ("Crowley") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,649,924 to Taccardi ("Taccardi"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner states that the sensor electrodes in Taccardi detect a potential field generated by the excitation wavefront, and thus "couple an electric field to a separate electric potential" (*see*, Office Action, page 2). The Examiner also states that Applicants failed to "show that Taccardi fails to disclose the ability to couple an electric field to a separate electric potential" (*see*, Office Action, page 4).

However, there is no discussion in Taccardi regarding use of the potential to determine the location of the catheter. The detection of the electric potential in Taccardi identifies the location of the focus of the excitation wavefront (*see*, Taccardi, col. 4, lines 15-35) and allows for mapping of the excitation wavefront, but in order to determine the location of the wavefront focus in the heart tissue using the electrodes on the catheter, the location of the catheter must already be known at the time the potential is detected.

In the Advisory Action issued December 8, 2005, the Examiner stated that the claims did not positively set forth providing an indication of the location of the catheter. Claims 1, 2, and 5 have thus been amended to further clarify that the structure includes a "means coupled to the electrode for delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential external to the heart for providing an indication of the location of the catheter."

Taccardi does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, a catheter having a "means coupled to the electrode for delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential external to the heart for providing an indication of the location of the catheter and for creating an image of the location of the electrode within the heart" as recited in claims 1, 2, and 5. The Examiner further admits that Crowley also does not teach such a feature, since Crowley does not

teach non-contact electrodes (*see*, Office Action, page 2). For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, and 5 are patentable over Crowley in view of Taccardi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, and 5 are respectfully requested.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,824,005 to Motamedi *et al.* ("Motamedi") in view of Taccardi. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Examiner states that Motamedi does not teach a non-contact electrode, which means that Motamedi does not teach or suggest a combination of elements which includes a "means for delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential for providing an indication of the location of the catheter" as recited in claim 3. Further, as discussed above, Taccardi does not teach or suggest a combination of elements which includes a means for "delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential for providing an indication of the location of the catheter" as recited in claim 3. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentable over Motamedi in view of Taccardi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,641,649 to Walinsky *et al.* ("Walinsky") in view of Taccardi. Applicants respectfully traverse. The Examiner states that Walinsky does not teach a non-contact sensing electrode, which means that Walinsky does not teach or suggest a combination of elements which includes a "means for delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential for providing an

indication of the location of the catheter" as recited in claim 4. Further, as discussed above, Taccardi does not teach or suggest a combination of elements which includes a means for "delivering and/or receiving a current pulse for coupling an electric field to a separate electric potential for providing an indication of the location of the catheter" as recited in claim 4. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over Walinsky in view of Taccardi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michelle K. Holoubek  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 54,179

Date: 2/28/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

499748\_1.DOC